

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17 through 26 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and, thus, claims 27 through 31 remain in this application. Claims 27 and 30 have been amended.

Claims 27 through 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to fall into one of the four statutory categories of invention. Claims 27 and 30 are hereby amended to tie the parts of these method claims to a particular machine, namely a transceiver, a processor and a memory of the wireless communication device. Claims 28, 29 and 31 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 27. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 27 through 31 are respectfully requested.

Claims 27 through 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,203 B1 to Feiertag, et al. (hereinafter Feiertag)).

Independent claim 27 provides, *inter alia*, a wireless communication device that receives a media content item and a first time-to-live (TTL) associated with the media content item from a remote device, receives a second TTL associated with the media content item from the remote device, and replaces the first TTL with the second TTL. Thus, the replacement of the TTL occurs at the wireless communication device.

In contrast, Feiertag describes a method of a data server for updating a time-to-live period for a data object stored in cache. As illustrated in FIG. 3 and explained at col. 9, lines 1 through 9, the time to live (TTL) is updated by a TTL calculation logic 242 for a data object in cache 206. As illustrated in FIG. 2 and explained at col. 5, line 64, through col. 6, line 36, the TTL determination logic 242 and the cache 206 operate as part of inline server 202 and/or offline server 204. Feiertag does not describe or suggest replacement of the TTL at a wireless communication device, as opposed to a data server, as required by claim 27. Therefore, claim 27 distinguishes from Feiertag.

Claims 28 through 31 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 27. Therefore, claims 28 through 31 distinguish from Feiertag for the reasons stated above for claim 27.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 27 through 31 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>11/23/2009</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	